UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,236	01/29/2001	Daniel Isaac Goodman	60644-8016.US01	9845

22918 7590 10/17/2007

PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 2168
MENLO PARK, CA 94026

EXAMINER	
KHOSHNOODI, NADIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2137	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/774,236	GOODMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nadia Khoshnoodi	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *176-187* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *1/29/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/8-23-2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-12,14-18,25-37,39-43,50-58,60-63,67-79,81-84,88-92,115-132,141,142, and 171-174.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1-12,14-18,25-37,39-43,50-58,60-63,67-79,81-84,88-92,115-132,141,142, and 171-174.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/18/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Claims 13,19-24,38,44-49,59,64-66,80,85-87,93-114,133-140,143-170, and 175 have been cancelled. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to the currently amended and previously presented pending claims filed 8/3/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Furthermore, newly presented claims 176-187 have been fully considered but are restricted as detailed below.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 176-187 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: these claims are directed towards a method for securely storing displayed encrypted content where the specifics of how and where the content is stored are not included in the original invention claimed by Applicants. Specifically, the previously presented invention deals with decrypting content and dynamically

generating a display layout in order to render the previously encrypted text to a graphics display and not how to store the content before or after displaying the data.

Since Applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 176-187 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

Applicants contend that "neither Pomerantz nor Saito describe dynamically generating a layout for a page." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saito suggests a WWW browser which deals with text string extraction for text that is to be displayed by a webpage (where HTML is commonly used to display a web page using various fields and allows for dynamically generating a layout for a page) in col. 5, lines 13-27. Saito further teaches that the text string information is displayed using a TextOut() and ExtTextOut() function in an API, i.e. using an intervening function in order to properly display the layout of the text (col. 5, lines 28-39). Specifically, Saito teaches that the WWW browser outputs the text information in a line of words/line of text strings, i.e. dynamically generating the layout of text on a page based on the number of words/text strings in a line (col. 6, lines 1-7). Saito was then used in combination with Pomerantz et al. to dynamically generate a layout for a page after the text has been decrypted, i.e. where each encrypted line of text has been replaced (using the intervening function) with its decrypted line of text strings and displaying the decrypted line of text strings based on dynamically generating that layout for output on a graphics device. Therefore, Saito

Due to the reasons stated above, and since the claims do not specifically include the details regarding the derivation of the layout and more specifically what steps may or may not be involved in dynamically generating a layout for a page other than just the basic definition of what creating a layout entails, the Examiner maintains the prior art rejections with respect to the pending claims. The cited prior arts of record taken in combination with one another teach the limitations that the Applicant suggests distinguish from the prior art, since the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation (MPEP 2111). Therefore, it is the Examiner's conclusion that the pending claims are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record as presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12, 14-18, 25-28, 30-33, 37, 39-43, 50-53, 55-58, 60-63, 67-74, 76-79, 81-84, 88-92, 115-132, 141-142, and 171-174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomerantz et al. US Patent No. 6,178,243 and further in view of Saito et al., US Patent No. 5,900,005.

As per claims 1, 26, and 171:

Pomerantz et al. substantially teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising

identifying a designated portion of original content contained within a page to be protected (col. 6, lines 42-54 and Fig. 2A), modifying the page comprising encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (col. 6, lines 42-54 and Fig. 2A), replacing the designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (col. 7, lines 1-9 and Fig. 2B), rendering[1] the page into a graphics device comprising: decrypting the portion of encrypted text prior to displaying the page (col. 6, lines 28-34); and converting the text into graphics output (col. 6, lines 28-34); and displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (col. 6, lines 28-34).

Not explicitly disclosed is wherein rendering the page includes dynamically generating a layout for display of the page based on spatial characteristics of the of one form of text instead of spatial characteristics of an inputted form of text, to ensure that the display layout for the page corresponds to that of a page containing the designated portion of original text wherein a layout for display of a page defines spatial characteristics of text, the characteristics of text including (j) numbers of words per line (col. 8, line 8-20). However, Saito teaches that when rendering a display to a web page, an operating system function is used to replace words/text strings with different text, where the operating system has a function call to the text that is to be output (col. 5, lines 28-39 and col. 6, line 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Pomerantz et al. for the rendering function to include dynamically generating a display layout for a web site and

[1] Although the word "render" was not specifically used, the definition according to www.netlingo.com shows that the function of rendering does take place. Below is the definition of render used.

> **Render** - To depict something. For example, an HTML author creatively renders text and graphics on a Web page into columns and rows, and a browser automatically renders the Web page by interpreting the HTML code.

replacing the text input portion, which would be the on-screen section selected for a cut/copy command (taught by Pomerantz et al.), with another text output portion which is the decrypted form of the text retrieved by the operating system TextOut() or ExtTextOut() function (taught by Saito) and then displaying the decrypted text to the screen. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Saito teaches that rendering text in the format described allows for convenient text extraction and replacing any arbitrary word(s) on a screen in col. 1, lines 59-61.

As per claims 2, 27, 52, and 73:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the page is a web page (col. 4, lines 35-44).

As per claims 3, 28, 53, and 74:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page (col. 4, lines 35-44).

As per claims 5, 30, 55, and 76:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the page is part of a document produced by a software application (col. 8, lines 56-60).

As per claims 6, 31, 56, and 77:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a memory device (col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 2).

As per claims 7, 32, 57, and 78:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the graphics device is a screen device (col. 4, lines 35-44).

As per claims 8, 33, 58, and 79:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the graphics device is a graphics port[2] (col. 8, lines 19-36). Although there is no explicit reference made to a graphics port, the elements referred to in the detailed description use ports to transfer graphics, thus it is identical to there being a graphics port.

As per claims 12 and 37:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method wherein the content and said encrypting comprises padding encrypted text so that identical words have distinct encrypted representations

---

[2] The definition of port as pasted from www.netlingo.com is as follows:

> **Port** - Commonly known as the place where information goes into and out of a computer, or both. For example, the serial port on a personal computer is where a modem or printer is connected.
>
> On the Internet, "port" often refers to a number that is shown in a URL, following a colon right after the domain name. Every service on an Internet server "listens" on a particular port number. Most of these services have standard port numbers. Web servers normally listen on port 80, and the standard Gopher port is 70. (Services can also listen on nonstandard ports, in which case the port number must be specified in a URL when the server is accessed.)

(col. 7, lines 1-41). Although the term padding is not used, the definition of padding[3] suggests that it is inherent.

As per claims 14, 39, 60, and 81:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (col. 4, lines 35-44). Although the term "raster output" is not explicitly used, a CRT[4] is used as the display device, hence it is identical to that of a "raster output."

As per claims 15 and 40:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method/system wherein said identifying, said encrypting, and said replacing are performed by a server computer, and wherein said controlling,

---

[3] According to the Hacking Lexicon dictionary online, the definition of padding is as follows:

> Padding - Padding is the process of adding unused data to the end of a message in order to make it conform to a certain length. For example, block-ciphers often work on blocks that are 64-bits (8-bytes) long. Therefore, if you have a message that is 77-bytes long, you will need to "pad" it with an extra 3-bytes to make it an even 80-bytes in size (10-blocks).
> **Key point:** Padding is a regular feature of all crypto algorithms, including hashing and encryption. Some algorithms have been broken due to poor choices for padding. Most importantly, however, the size of the message can often reveal details about its contents. For example, let's assume a protocol whereby somebody accepts something with a simple message of "yes", but when it declines, it says "no" along with a reason why it was rejected. Therefore, even though the messages are encrypted, the "yes" will be a short message but the "no" will be a long message.

[4] The definition of Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) from the Free Online Dictionary of Computing is as pasted below:

> CRT - An electrical device for displaying images by exciting phosphor dots with a scanned electron beam. CRTs are found in computer VDUs and monitors, televisions and oscilloscopes. The first commercially practical CRT was perfected on 29 January 1901 by Allen B DuMont.
>
> A large glass envelope containing a negative electrode (the cathode) emits electrons (formerly called "cathode rays") when heated, as in a vacuum tube. The electrons are accelerated across a large voltage gradient toward the flat surface of the tube (the screen) which is covered with phosphor. When an electron strikes the phosphor, light is emitted. The electron beam is deflected by electromagnetic coils around the outside of the tube so that it scans across the screen, usually in horizontal stripes. This scan pattern is known as a raster. By controlling the current in the beam, the brightness at any particular point (roughly a "pixel") can be varied.

said rendering, and said displaying are performed by a client computer connected to the server computer over a network (col. 10, lines 55-59).

As per claims 16, 41, 61, and 82:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content (col. 5, lines 28-35).

As per claims 17, 42, 62, and 83:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the operating system function is a TextOut function (col. 4, lines 45-57).

As per claims 18, 43, 63, and 84:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the operating system function is a type of DrawText function (col. 4, lines 45-57).

As per claims 25, 50, 70, and 91:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 24, 49, 69, and 90. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the operating system function is a GetTextExtent function (col. 4, lines 45-57).

As per claims 51, 72, and 172:

Pomerantz et al. teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code, comprising accessing a page containing a portion of encrypted content (col. 8, lines 1-7,

and Fig 2B); rendering[5] the page into a graphics device comprising: intervening with at least one function that controls layouts for display of the page, comprising determining a layout for display of the page based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display of the page corresponds to the display of a page containing decrypted text, wherein a layout for display of a page defines special characteristics of the text, the characteristics including at least one of (a) positions of characters, (b) heights of characters, (c) widths of characters, (d) widths of words, (e) shapes of characters, (f) spacings between characters, (g) spacings between words, (h) spacings between lines, (i) numbers of characters per line, (j) numbers of words per line, (k) page margins, and (l) paragraph indentations (col. 8, line 8-20; col. 8, line 34-49; and Fig. 2A); decrypting the portion of encrypted text prior to displaying the page (col. 6, lines 28-34); and converting the text into graphics output (col. 6, lines 28-34); and displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (col. 6, lines 28-34).

Not explicitly disclosed is dynamically generating a display layout. However, Saito teaches rendering a display to a web page, text that is to be output replaces a certain portion of page and wherein web pages are known to dynamically generate a display layout (col. 5, lines 28-39 and col. 6, line 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Pomerantz et al. for the rendering function to include dynamically generating a display layout for a web page and replacing the text input portion, which would be the on-screen section selected for a cut/copy command (taught by Pomerantz et al.), with another text output portion which is the decrypted

[5] See footnote (1) on page 4

form of the text retrieved by TextOut() or ExtTextOut() function (taught by Saito) and then displaying the decrypted text to the screen. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Saito teaches that rendering text in the format described allows for convenient text extraction and replacing any arbitrary word(s) on a screen and results in dynamically generating the display layout of the text as well in col. 1, lines 59-61.

As per claims 67 and 88:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 51 and 72. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method/system, wherein said dynamically generating comprises calculating widths of character strings (col. 8, line 34-49).

As per claims 68 and 89:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 67 and 88. Furthermore, Pomerantz teach the method/system, wherein said dynamically generating comprises decrypting encrypted text strings (col. 8, line 34-49).

As per claims 69 and 90:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 68 and 89. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings (col. 6, lines 1-7).

As per claim 71:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 51. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method further comprising receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer (col. 10, lines 55-59).

As per claim 92:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 72. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach a system further comprising a network connector and a receiver receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer via said network connector (col. 10, lines 55-59).

As per claims 115, 124, and 173:

Pomerantz et al. substantially teaches a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code comprising formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a layout for display of the page (col. 7, lines 1-9), comprising intervening with at least one function that controls layouts for display of the page, to base the layout for display of the page on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of a first portion of text, to ensure that the display of the page corresponds to the display of a page containing the second portion of text, wherein a layout for display of a page defines spatial characteristics of text, the characteristics including at least one of (a) positions of characters, (b) heights of characters, (c) widths of characters, (d) widths of words, (e) shapes of characters, (f) spacings between characters, (g) spacings between words, (h) spacings between lines, (i) numbers of characters per line, (j) numbers of words per line, (k) page margins, and (l) paragraph indentations (col. 8, line 8-20; col. 8, line 34-49; and Fig. 2A); rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text (col. 7, lines 1-9), converting second portion of text to a graphics output (col. 6, lines 28-34), and writing the graphics output into the graphics device (col. 6, lines 28-34).

Not explicitly disclosed is dynamically generating a display layout. However, Saito teaches rendering a display to a web page, text that is to be output replaces a certain portion of page and wherein web pages are known to dynamically generate a display layout (col. 5, lines 28-39 and col. 6, line 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Pomerantz et al. for the rendering function to include dynamically generating a display layout for a web page and replacing the text input portion, which would be the on-screen section selected for a cut/copy command (taught by Pomerantz et al.), with another text output portion which is the decrypted form of the text retrieved by TextOut() or ExtTextOut() function (taught by Saito) and then displaying the decrypted text to the screen. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Saito teaches that rendering text in the format described allows for convenient text extraction and replacing any arbitrary word(s) on a screen and results in dynamically generating the display layout of the text as well in col. 1, lines 59-61.

As per claims 116 and 125:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Pomerantz teaches wherein the first portion of text has the same word width as does the second portion of text (col. 8, lines 8-20 and Fig. 2A-2B).

As per claims 117 and 126:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Pomerantz teaches the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (col. 4, lines 35-44).

As per claims 118 and 127:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system of replacing the first portion of text with the second portion of text. Furthermore, Saito teach the method occurring within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output (col. 5, lines 28-35).

As per claims 119 and 128:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the operating system function is a TextOut function (col. 6, lines 45-63).

As per claims 120 and 129:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Furthermore, Saito teaches the method/system wherein the operating system function is a type of DrawText function (col. 6, lines 45-63).

As per claims 121 and 130:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Pomerantz et al. teach the method wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with the second text strings and calculating widths of the second text portion based on selected font types and font sizes (col. 8, line 1-34).

As per claims 122 and 131:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with second text strings and calculating widths of the second text strings based on selected font types and font sizes as applied to claims 121 and 130 above. Furthermore, Saito teach the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings (col. 6, lines 1-7).

As per claims 123 and 132:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system wherein replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of characters as applied to claims 122 and 131 above. Furthermore, Saito et al. teach the method/system wherein the operating system function is a GetTextExtent function (col. 6, lines 45-63).

As per claims 141-142 and 174:

Pomerantz et al. substantially teach a method for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout (col. 7, lines 1-9; col. 8, lines 1-34; and Figs. 2A-2B) and replacing a first portion of text with a second portion of text when rendering the page according to the layout for display by a graphics device (col. 7, lines 52-63).

Not explicitly disclosed is replacing first text strings with second text strings within a patched operating system function that dynamically generates a layout for display of a page. However, Saito teaches that when rendering a display to a web page, an operating system function is used to replace words/text strings with different text, where the operating system has

a function call to the text that is to be output (col. 5, lines 28-39 and col. 6, line 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Pomerantz et al. for the rendering function to include dynamically generating a display layout for a web site and replacing the text input portion, which would be the on-screen section selected for a cut/copy command (taught by Pomerantz et al.), with another text output portion which is the decrypted form of the text retrieved by the operating system TextOut() or ExtTextOut() function (taught by Saito) and then displaying the decrypted text to the screen. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Saito teaches that rendering text in the format described allows for convenient text extraction and replacing any arbitrary word(s) on a screen in col. 1, lines 59-61.

III. Claims 4, 29, 54, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomerantz et al. US Patent No. 6,178,243 and Saito, US Patent No. 5,900,005 as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, 73, 94, and 105 above, and further in view of the definition of XML, found at netlingo.com.

As per claims 4, 29, 54, and 75:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein the web page is an XML page. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Pomerantz et al. to incorporate the web page as an XML page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at

the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by the definition of XML as found on www.netlingo.com and pasted below:

> A programming language/specification developed by the W3C. XML is a pared-down version of SGML, designed especially for Web documents. It enables Web authors and Web developers to create their own customized tags to provide functionality not available with HTML. For example, XML supports links that point to multiple documents (as opposed to HTML links, which can reference just one destination each). XML provides a powerful set of tools for developing a new generation of Web applications, including tools like database exchange, distribution of processing to clients, multiple views of data, intelligent agents, management of document collections, and so on.

IV. Claims 9-11 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pomerantz et al. US Patent No. 6,178,243 and Saito, US Patent No. 5,900,005 as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claim 9 and 34:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Pomerantz to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of characters. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 8, lines 4-8.

As per claim 10 and 35:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on

encoding of words. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Pomerantz et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of words. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29.

As per claim 11 and 36:

Pomerantz et al. and Saito substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed is the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Pomerantz et al. to carry out the encryption and adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 13, lines 22-26.

References Cited, Not Used:

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(1) US Patent No. 6,282,653
(2) US Patent No. 6,052,780
(3) US Patent No. 5,822,432
(4) US Pub. No. 2002/0188570
(5) US Pub No. 2002/0021807
(6) US Patent No. 5,983,227 – Specifically addresses the benefits of dynamic page generation.

The previously cited references are relevant due to the manner in which the invention is claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nadia Khoshnoodi
Examiner
Art Unit 2137
10/14/2007

NK

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER